

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/681,391

Applicant(s)

BYRNE ET AL.

Examiner

Igor N. Borissov

Art Unit

3628

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Igor N. Borissov.

(3) _____.

(2) Representative Daniel M. Fitzgerald.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-9 and 13-43.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: During the interview availability of the claims over the prior art of record was discussed. Agreed, the prior art of record does not teach that one of the applied validation rules determines whether data representing an amount of usage of a piece of equipment included within the corresponding export file is invalid; or that the error report identifies the data records that violate at least one of the validation rules due to at least one of a processing error at the local computer system and an inputting error at the remote computer system. Furthermore, the examiner indicated that claims 19-22 as currently recited raise 35 USC 112 and 101 issues. Finally, the Representative elected to cancel claims 19-22 and gave authorization for the Examiner Amendment to thereby place the claims into the condition of allowance.